DETAILED ACTION

In response to a Pre-Appeal Brief Conference Request filed on 11/25/09,

prosecution is hereby reopened. Claims 1-6, 8-20 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1-6, 8-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Glazer (US 2002/0129052) in view of Dias (US 7,149,973) in view of Lee (US

6,064,856).

Regarding claim 1, Glazer discloses a method for creating a presentation

including interactive media relating to polls or quizzes, wherein the presentation is

divided into a plurality of sections, said method comprising (fig. 1):

Creating user polls and quizzes on a remote server ([0036-0038]);

Taking a video stream including a plurality of video frames, each said video

frame including a time stamp ([0006, 0023]);

Sequentially displaying said video frame by frame on a display device, starting

from an initial video frame of said video stream ([0006, 0023]);

Uploading the presentation into the remote server which is accessible to end-

users (fig. 13, [0097]);

Generating a list of available polls and quizzes stored on the remote server ([0076-0078]);

Glazer does not specifically disclose adding placeholder slides corresponding to at least one of a user polls, quizzes, and website links, which are accessible via the remote server; replacing each place holder slid with at least one of a website link, a poll selected from the list of available polls and quizzes stored on the remote server, and a quiz selected from the list of available polls and quizzes stored on the remote server.

However, Dias discloses adding placeholder slides corresponding to at least one of a user polls, quizzes, and website links, which are accessible via the remote server; replacing each place holder slide with at least one of a website link, a poll selected from the list of available polls and quizzes stored on the remote server, and a quiz selected from the list of available polls and quizzes stored on the remote server (col. 6 lines 34-42, col. 7 lines 44-56). It would have been obvious to combine the placeholder slides of Dias into the presentation system of Glazer. This would allow authors to easily place their own polls and quizzes in predetermined slots in the presentation.

Glazer in view of Dias does not disclose recording information regarding an end-user's usage of said presentation, said information including the end-user's identity, how far the end-user watched said presentation, what the end user has scored on a quiz, feedback provided by the end-user on a poll, and how much elapsed time the end-user spent viewing each of the plurality of sections of the presentation.

However, Lee discloses recording information regarding an end-user's usage of said presentation, said information including the end-user's identity, how far the end-

user watched said presentation, what the end user has scored on a quiz, feedback

provided by the end-user on a poll, and how much elapsed time the end-user spent

viewing each of the plurality of sections of the presentation (fig. 16, col. 10 lines 7-19).

It would have been obvious to combine the user recording of Lee into the presentation

system of Glazer in view of Dias. This would allow presenters to track the progress of

the viewers.

      Regarding claim 2, Glazer disclose a method for playing a presentation

including polls or quizzes, wherein the presentation is divided into a plurality of sections,

said method comprising (fig. 1):

      Receiving a presentation from a remote server ([0097]);

      Sequentially playing the frames, starting from an initial frame of the stream of

data ([0006, 0023]);

      Selecting from a table of contents being displayed on a display device of a local

computer, content related to at least one of a poll and a quiz to be accessed by the end

user (fig. 10);

      Displaying the at least one of a poll and a quiz to be accessed by an end-user

(fig. 5);

      Glazer does not specifically disclose pausing said stream of data when one of

the frames contains placeholder data related to at least one of a poll and a quiz stored

on the remote server.

      However, Dias discloses pausing said stream of data when one of the frames

contains placeholder data related to at least one of a poll and a quiz stored on the

remote server (col. 6 lines 34-42, col. 7 lines 44-56). It would have been obvious to

combine the placeholder slides of Dias into the presentation system of Glazer. This

would allow authors to easily place their own polls and quizzes in predetermined slots in

the presentation.

Glazer in view of Dias does not specifically disclose monitoring usage of said

presentation; and recording information regarding an end-user's usage of said

presentation, said information including the end-user's identity, how far the end-user

watched said presentation, what the end user has scored on a quiz, feedback provided

by the end-user on a poll, and how much elapsed time the end-user spent viewing each

of the plurality of sections of the presentation.

However, Lee discloses monitoring usage of said presentation; and recording

information regarding an end-user's usage of said presentation, said information

including the end-user's identity, how far the end-user watched said presentation, what

the end user has scored on a quiz, feedback provided by the end-user on a poll, and

how much elapsed time the end-user spent viewing each of the plurality of sections of

the presentation (fig. 16, col. 10 lines 7-19). It would have been obvious to combine the

user recording of Lee into the presentation system of Glazer in view of Dias. This would

allow presenters to track the progress of the viewers.

Regarding claim 3, see the rejections of claims 1 and 2.

Regarding claim 4, Glazer discloses collecting indexing and other data from a

server database and displaying said indexing and other data to a presentation's author

creating indexes for users to look up presentations based on content and authoring log-on that validates authors ([0027]).

Regarding claim 5, Glazer discloses wherein said presentation is hosted by remote server, and said remote server hosting presentations user tracking and monitoring indexing for users to look up select presentations, encrypting presentation content and deploying licenses for viewing protected content ([0027, 0122]).

Regarding claim 6, Glazer discloses wherein the polls or quiz results are stored for later analysis ([0078]).

Regarding claim 8, see the rejection of claim 2.

Regarding claim 9, see the rejection of claim 1.

Regarding claim 10, see the rejection of claim 6.

Regarding claim 11, Glazer discloses wherein said presentation indexing a video and slides to allow a user to jump to different portion of the presentation ([0094]).

Regarding claim 12, Glazer discloses wherein said presentation is paused for a poll or quiz when a poll or quiz is initiated by said user or required by said presentation ([0037]).

Regarding claim 13, Glazer discloses wherein said presentation program synchronizes a video with server program pages referenced at that point to specific polls or quizzes ([0023. 0047]).

Regarding claim 14, Glazer discloses wherein an end user accesses said presentation by providing a valid authorization key ([0122]).

Regarding claim 15, Glazer discloses wherein said presentation program shutdown if the user attempts to access an encrypted presentation without an authorized key ([0122]).

Regarding claim 16, see the rejection of claim 1.

Regarding claim 17, see the rejection of claim 2.

Regarding claim 18, see the rejection of claim 3.

Regarding claim 19, see the rejection of claim 1.

Regarding claim 20, see the rejection of claim 1.

Response to Arguments

In response to applicant's arguments, applicant's arguments are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

Claims 1-6, 8-20 are rejected.

Correspondence Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HYUN J. HONG whose telephone number is (571)270-1553. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30am-7pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Joseph Hirl can be reached on (571)272-3685. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/H. J. H./
Examiner, Art Unit 2426

/Joseph P. Hirl/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2426
April 12, 2010